

Glass Ceiling In Pakistan: A Myth Or Reality?

Khurram Shakir

Phd scholar and adjunct faculty member IQRA University, Karachi

Lecturer in Department of Business Administration, Benazir Bhutto Shaheed University Lyari, Karachi, Pakistan

E-mail: khurramshakir@yahoo.com

Siraj Jamal Siddiqui

Head of Business Studies IQRA University, Karachi, Pakistan

E-mail: siraj.j@iqra.edu.pk

Abstract

This research intends to explore the existence and concept of glass ceiling in Pakistan. As it is widely cited that glass ceiling refers to the position one wants to achieve and is reachable yet he/she is deprived of that position due to some discriminatory effect. Generally the deprived are the obvious minorities and most certainly the women of society in context with the corporate world. But the emerging role of women as companies CEOs, policy makers and department heads of various companies in Pakistan motivates this study to find whether it is really gender discrimination being tagged as glass ceiling in Pakistan or is it mere perception leading us away from actual facts.

Keywords: Glass Ceiling, Obstacles faced by women

1. Introduction

The Glass ceiling is characterized as an invisible and unreachable obstacle that has been imposed on women and minorities in order to prevent them from uprising to the higher ranks of the organizations hierarchy, irrespective of their qualification, skills, competencies or accomplishment. Earlier such term or metaphor was restricted to the barriers imposed on the working women but now it is broadened to the hindrance or barrier in marching forward of minorities and races as well.

(Federal Glass Ceiling Commission 1995b:4) "the unseen, yet unbreakable barrier that keeps minorities and women from rising to the upper rungs of the corporate ladder, regardless of their qualifications or achievements." Every sort of business has suffered from the problem of glass ceiling in past, it mainly exists for working females in the corporate world. People believe that females in organizations have faced tough time of glass ceiling, despite that they have coped to progress from positions of secretaries to managers. (Morrison and colleagues, 1991) expressed the glass ceiling as excluding person's progress just for being women not for their capability to manage work at top levels.

Mainly the barrier prevailing minorities and women seems to exist in developing countries where the job opportunities are scarce and the societies are male dominating. The male do not want a supervisor or the manager from the counter gender to take the hold of them and order them, especially in male dominating societies.

As now a days there are almost equal number of opportunities for both men and women in Pakistan in different fields like medical, nursing, news casters, restaurants, women are still scarce in senior ranks and top management. (Belgihiti & Kartochian, 2008) notion reveal that women and men both have same barriers when they reach at executive level but the numbers of barriers are double for women at same level. (Shandana Shoaib, 2010) recognized the presence of glass ceiling in society as gender discrimination. Majority of companies favor men at top of the management and in this regard woman proportion is very low in contrast to man. (Zahid Ali Chanar, 2011) identified that females with lower qualification are more victimized of discrimination as compared to Females with higher qualifications in health and education department. He found no significant discrimination against females in education department of private sector, instead he mentioned reverse gender discrimination in the education department of private sector in Hyderabad district (Rana, 2007) concluded in private companies females do not face Glass Ceiling as obstacle to a big picture. (Batool et al, 2012) survey explains that few women in academic positions face barriers in career advancement.

Since the concept of glass ceiling, much debate has been carried out in favor and against of glass ceiling effect and different researchers have different ideas. Some wrote it as invisible barrier, some said it has become visible but there is also a school of thought which questions the existence of glass ceiling and having the view point that it's not the gender or racial discrimination which prevents women and minorities to reach on higher positions but their competencies, education and commitment. As it is very easy to censure organizations and management for discrimination against women and minority when you stuck at some point of your career or under paid but it's very hard to prove that it's not because of race or gender but their education and competencies to lead. Author's notion is to define glass ceiling as set of challenges which have been successfully faced by several women and minorities who have cracked this glass ceiling and reached to the top positions and those who couldn't made it pronounce their selves victim of glass ceiling effect.

Author proposes to evaluate the impact of invisible obstacles for women of Pakistani corporate industry generally and service industry exclusively where existence of glass ceiling is being stated in literature as prime cause of minimal representation of women at top managerial and administrative positions in Pakistan. Author has established the argument and try to reveal whether it is gender discrimination which is impeding the women of Pakistan to get higher management position and to earn less on similar position as compare to men or not. This research will help us to highlight the actual obstacle and will suggest possible solutions to create maximum opportunities for women at higher hierarchal levels in Pakistan discouraging the perception of existence of glass ceiling in Pakistan.

2.Literature Review

(Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005)state women have shown immense pace in achieving access to organizations and razing the glass ceiling. In spite of such achievements majority of women still stay trapped in middle management. The problem of glass ceiling continues to grow though there is no explicit hindrance which keeps women out of the professional growth competition and acquiring advanced job positions. All the organization claims that they are an equal opportunity employer and no advertisement claims “minorities or women are not eligible to apply”. (Rai & Srivastava, 2008)state the perspective of corporate that there is no such thing exists like glass ceiling and they support their argument as women usually leave their job in the middle of the career ,have tendency to work part time and prefer low-risk jobs. Moreover they say globalization has created enormous amount of chances for carrier development. (Blau et al, 2006)Women give priority to their families as compare to men and prepare a more tortuous course of action for their professions. That’s why investing in education and training become less beneficial for women besides the knowledge gained becomes outdated in career breaks. (Schneer & Reitman, 2002) Family formation creates huge impact on women’s success in career as responsibilities of children and home on women augment their stress level. (Polachek ,1981: 68) “If women were to have a full commitment to the labor force, the number of women professionals would increase by 35%, the number of women in managerial professions would more than double, and women in menial occupations would decrease by more than 25%” .

(De la Rica and colleagues, 2005) stated that women as compared to men have fewer opportunities to advance on jobs because the jobs they do have little room for promotions. Most females managers are engage in such jobs which based on interpersonal skills. According to (Gavray,2004) Such jobs in most companies are being viewed less important in comparison to operational, technical and financial work mainly carried out by men. (Lemiere & Silvera,2008) Even these position mostly occupied by females have relatively fewer chances of promotions , career development as well as less compensated then men occupied posts.

(Mayer,1999:56)states that the selection of Carleton Fiorina as first female CEO of (Hewlett-Packard) in the year 1999 was seen as a proof that a glass ceiling do not exist anymore. Fiorina declared that women encounter “no limits whatsoever. There is no glass ceiling”. Moreover in last few years Irene Rosenfeld of Kraft food and Patricia Woertz of Archer Daniels-Midland also shake the concept of glass ceiling by becoming CEOs of fortune 500 and Forbes 400 companies respectively.

If we take example of Pakistan, few notable names are Mohtarma Fatima Jinnah, Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto(First Women Prime Minister of Pakistan), Shamshad Akhtar(Governer state Bank) ,Miss Akram Khatoon(First President FWBL) , Roshaneh Zafar (Managing Director Kashf Foundation), Bilquis Edhi(Edhi Foundation), Shireen Mazari, Aasma Jahangir

It is evident by above names that for women of Pakistan, opportunities are equally available to excel in any field but most of them chose less career oriented jobs as (Pipes ,1996). Women can get on top ladder of hierarchal levels by proving their selves as ambitious,diligent and value addition to bottom line if they have the will but many women do not opt for striving career goals. (Cutler & Jackson ,2002). It is family responsibility which hinders women career development not the organization or management. (Hewlett et al, 2010) unleashes a different dimension in their report named as sponsor effect which explains that it not gender discrimination against women but lack of male (and female) sponsorship which keeps them away from top position because despite being qualified for leadership they do not have that support which is required to become prominent and motivated to pass the hazardous passage of top management safely. (Baumgartner & Schneider, 2010) refer queen bee syndrome as one of causes which impedes females advancement and development as professional in corporate environment where women on top positions avoid helping women striving to raze the glass ceiling. Queen bees feel that women should struggle and put efforts to be on top ladder of hierarchy as they did for the same . This syndrome does not let Queen Bees to ease the process for women aspiring to be on higher levels in organizations. Moreover majority of queen bees do not encourage training and development for ambitious women. Moreover women’s individual strategies also effect her career (Bastid ,2003) as stated by (Hafen, 2009;Litwin & Hallstein, 2007) women involvement in manipulation, gossips , exclusion and social isolation disturb functionality of office settings and eliminate the possibility of their promotions and development as

professionals in organization. (Ferrari, 2011) Such approaches and conducts are usually consequent of female's positions inside their social group. Other than strategies, their parlance also been noted as a reason of not being placed on leading position in corporations. (Oakley, 2000) says soft and firm types of communication by women is seen improper specially at top levels in majority of corporations.

In glass ceiling literature plenty of research is available on gender pay gap where it is proven that women are underpaid as compared to men on similar positions. Do organizations or men play any discriminatory role in setting low pays against women? Now the gender pay gap reality is quite obvious after recent researches which reveal that women are not underpaid as compared to men according to (Derek Thompson, 2013) cited in The Atlantic "The real gap isn't between men and women doing the same job. It's between the different jobs that men and women take". As men are still very prominent in majority of highly paid job where 90% of lowest paying jobs are occupied by women. (Carrie Lukas, 2011) cited in THE WALL STREET JOURNAL the statistics of Labor's Time Use survey which reveals the fact that full-time working women spend 0.74 hours less than full-time working men. This 9% less work make women to earn less than men.

(Browne & Meyer, 2003) concluded that the truth of glass ceiling is confusing and suggested that the looking glass as most suitable metaphor for some people than glass ceiling. They emphasized the importance of employee employer association above all strategies to deal with the complex nature of visible and invisible obstacle to progress in organizations once identified by individual or group of managers.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Approach

3.1.2. Quantitative Approach:

The research is based on quantitative approach. Through quantitative research, the researcher tries to investigate the connection between the dependent variable (Glass Ceiling) and independent variable (Education, experience and family responsibilities, self selection, Sponsorship effect, queen bee effect and women strategies and style of communication). This approach will enable researcher apply the statistical technique and study the result.

3.2. Research Purpose:

The researcher used explanatory research to examine the relationship between dependent and independent variable. It will also help us to identify cause of certain actions and to present theories and predictions.

3.3. Research Design:

The research design is correlation research, because researcher wants to check the relationship between the variables and also wants to check its impact.

3.4. Data Source:

The research is primary and the data is collected through questionnaire from the employees of service and manufacturing industry.

3.5. Data Instrument:

The instrument used in this research is questionnaire and independent variable questions are self designed.

3.6. Target Population:

The population targeted in this research is employees' of several Telecommunications companies, Private Banks and Manufacturing companies.

3.7 Sample Size:

The sample size used in this research is 211.

3.8 Statistical Technique:

The statistical technique used in this research is frequency statistics, descriptive statistics and multiple linear regressions.

3.9. Data collection Technique:

The data is collected through questionnaire and analyzed it with liker scale (1 to 5). 1= strongly agree and 5= strongly disagree.

3.10. Research Hypothesis:

H0a = Education, experience and family responsibilities do not impact on glass ceiling

HAa = Education, experience and family responsibilities impact on glass ceiling

H0b = Self satisfaction does not impact on glass ceiling

HAb = Self satisfaction impacts on glass ceiling

H0c = Sponsorship effect does not impact on glass ceiling

HAc = Sponsorship effect impacts on glass ceiling

H0d = Queen bee effect does not impact on glass ceiling

HAd = Queen bee effect impacts on glass ceiling

H0e = Women strategies and styles of communication do not impact on glass ceiling

HAe = Women strategies and styles of communication impact on glass ceiling

3.11. Model Equation:

Glass ceiling = Constant + Education, experience and family responsibilities + Self-selection + Sponsorship effect + Queen bee effect + Women strategies and style of communication

$$Glass\ ceiling = f(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot EE + \beta_2 \cdot SS + \beta_3 \cdot SE + \beta_4 \cdot QB + \beta_5 \cdot WS)$$

4. Estimation or Analysis of Results

In this chapter, researcher intends to examine the results. The results have been extracted from the data filled in questionnaire by using SPSS.

4.1. Statistics

		Gender	Age	marital	cadre	experience	segment
N	Valid	211	211	211	211	211	211
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Analysis:

The statistics table indicates that there is a data conducted from 211 people and no data is missing.

4.2. Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	female	211	100.0	100.0	100.0

Analysis:

The data containing 211 observations, all observation are female.

4.3. Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-30	97	46.0	46.0	46.0
	31-40	86	40.8	40.8	86.7
	41-50	22	10.4	10.4	97.2
	51 and above	6	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	211	100.0	100.0	

Analysis:

Data frequency shows that majority of participants age falls between 20-30 years which is 46% the second largest population of participants is between 31-40 years which is around 41%. Participants of age from 41-50 years is 10% and 51 and above years is 3% only.

4.5. Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	single	98	46.4	46.4	46.4
	married	46	21.8	21.8	68.2
	married with children	66	31.3	31.3	99.5
	single parent	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	211	100.0	100.0	

Analysis:

Marital status of the data set shows that most of the participants are single, almost 46% of data, Second highest percentage of participants is 31% married with children, married participants are 22% and only one participant is single parent.

4.6.Cadre

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid line manager	74	35.1	35.1	35.1
middle management	121	57.3	57.3	92.4
higher management	16	7.6	7.6	100.0
Total	211	100.0	100.0	

Analysis:

Job cadre of the respondents shows that majority of the participants falls in middle management which is 57% and line managers are 35% of the data only approx 8% of data belongs to higher management.

4.7.Experience

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1year	30	14.2	14.2	14.2
2years	56	26.5	26.5	40.8
3years	28	13.3	13.3	54.0
4years	42	19.9	19.9	73.9
5years and more	55	26.1	26.1	100.0
Total	211	100.0	100.0	

Analysis:

Experience frequency of respondents shows that females with 2 years and 5 years and more experience are 26%, respondents with 4 years experience are 20%, participants with 1 year and 3 years are approx 14% and 13% respectively.

4.8.Segment

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid business	81	38.4	38.4	38.4
support	130	61.6	61.6	100.0
Total	211	100.0	100.0	

Analysis:

Segment data shows that majority of respondents belong to support segment which is 62% approximately and rest of 38% belongs to business.

4.9.Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	211	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	211	100.0

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure

4.10.Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.602	23

Analysis:

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability statistics test used to check the reliability of the data or questionnaire. The reliability of statistics critical value when questionnaire is reliable is 0.6. in our analysis it is 0.602, which shows that data is reliable and suitable for use in research.

4.11. Correlations

		EE	GC	SS	SE	QB	WS
EE	Pearson Correlation	1	-.034	.143*	.198**	.268**	.181**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.628	.038	.004	.000	.008
	N	211	211	211	211	211	211
GC	Pearson Correlation	-.034	1	.303**	-.079	.162*	.162*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.628		.000	.254	.018	.019
	N	211	211	211	211	211	211
SS	Pearson Correlation	.143*	.303**	1	.058	.040	-.047
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.038	.000		.405	.559	.497
	N	211	211	211	211	211	211
SE	Pearson Correlation	.198**	-.079	.058	1	.088	.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.254	.405		.202	.717
	N	211	211	211	211	211	211
QB	Pearson Correlation	.268**	.162*	.040	.088	1	.412**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.018	.559	.202		.000
	N	211	211	211	211	211	211
WS	Pearson Correlation	.181**	.162*	-.047	.025	.412**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.019	.497	.717	.000	
	N	211	211	211	211	211	211

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.12. Regression

4.12.1 Variables Entered/Removed(b)

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	WS, SE, SS, EE, QB(a)	.	Enter

a All requested variables entered.

b Dependent Variable: GC

4.12.2 Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.394 ^a	.155	.135	.53755	1.367

a. Predictors: (Constant), WS, SE, SS, EE, QB

b. Dependent Variable: GC

Analysis:

The model summary table has these items “R”, R Square, Adjusted R Square and Std. Error of the Estimate. The value of **R** is **.394** which shows the correlation between independent and dependent variable. The correlation between dependent and independent variable is **.394**. The value of **R-square** is **.155**, which shows the 15.5% variation on dependent variable which is “Glass ceiling” is explained due to change in independent variables.

4.13. ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	10.902	5	2.180	7.546	.000 ^b
	Residual	59.237	205	.289		
	Total	70.140	210			

a. Dependent Variable: GC

b. Predictors: (Constant), WS, SE, SS, EE, QB

Analysis

The table of Anova in regression shows the overall significance of model. The sig value “.000” shows that the overall model is significant because its value is less than 0.5. the F-statistics shows the combine effect of the

model. The combine effect of the model is “7.546”. The d.f which is degree of freedom indicates in total that, there is a sample of 211, but due to “n-1” it indicates 210. The predictors are used in this research are 205 and the residual which is also called the error, n-p-1, 211-5-1 equals 205.

4.14. Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.348	.310		4.345	.000
EE	-.128	.071	-.124	-1.813	.071
SS	.318	.063	.328	5.036	.000
SE	-.079	.059	-.088	-1.344	.180
QB	.116	.065	.129	1.785	.076
WS	.163	.078	.149	2.094	.038

a. Dependent Variable: GC

Analysis

This table shows the effect of each independent variable on dependent variable. The beta of EE is **-.124** which has a negative impact on Glass ceiling but the sig value indicates that this impact is not significant because sig value is **“.071”** which is greater than **5%**. The beta of SS is **“.328”**, which shows the positive impact on Glass ceiling and this impact is significant because the sig value is **“.000”** which is less than **5%**. The beta value of SE is **“-.088”**, which shows the negative impact on Glass ceiling, and impact is insignificant because the sig value is **“.180”** which is greater than **5%**. The beta value of QB is **“.129”** which shows the positive impact on Glass ceiling, but impact is insignificant because the sig value is **“.076”** which is greater than **5%**. The beta value of WS is **“.149”** which shows the positive impact on Glass ceiling, and its impact is also significant because the sig value is **“.038”** which is less than **5%**.

4.15. Model Equation

Glass ceiling = 1.348 + (-.124) Education, experience and family responsibilities + (.328)Self-selection + (-.088)Sponsorship effect + (.129)Queen bee effect + (.149)Women strategies and style of communication

5. Conclusion

This research reveals the perception of glass ceiling in Pakistan where women are being seen as deprived in salaries, underrepresented in various professions and un promotable to higher positions just because they are women. Précis we conducted this study to investigate whether glass ceiling is a myth or reality in Pakistan. What we discover in our research is being female in Pakistani organizations creates no gender based obstacle in carrier progression of women but women strategies and style of communication at work and their discretion to leave or select job/profession influence their way to top hierarchy in organizations. As both independent variables Self Selection and Women Strategies and style of communication are significant which shows if women face barrier in carrier progress it could be their own choice to engage in such professions which do not have enough room for promotions and their strategies at work to socialize and to communicate with others. Further the value of constant is also referring some other reasons which may contribute to make women career difficult. It is recommended that more research should be carried out to investigate other factors impeding women to progress in Pakistan.

References

- Bastid, F. (2004). *Mesurer la réussite de carrière des cadres : vers une intégration de la dimension extra-professionnelle*. Paper presented at the ctes du Congrès AGRH, Montréal.
- Batool, S. Q., Sajid, M. A., & Raza, H. (2012). Explanatory Study of Women in the Management of Universities. *Journal of Social and Development Science*, 412-419.
- Baumgartner, M., & Schneider, D. E. (2010). Perceptions of women in management: A thematic analysis of razing the glass ceiling. *Journal of Career Development*.
- Blau, F. D., Ferber, M. A., & Winkler, A. E. (2006). *The Economics of Women, Men and Work*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- BELGHITI- MAHUT S. et LANDRIEUX-KARTOCHIAN S. - *GRH et genre - Les défis de l'égalité hommes-femmes, chapitre 6, Le plafond de verre, encore et toujours, Paris, Vuibert, 105-122. 2008*
- Browne, N. M., & Meyer, A. G. (2003). Many Paths to Justice: The Glass Ceiling, The Looking Glass and Strategies for Getting to other side. *Hofstra Labor and Employment Law Journal Vol: 21:1*.

- Cutler, M. M., & Jackson, A. L. (2002). A Glass Ceiling or work / family conflict? . *The Journal of Business and Economics Studies*, 73-85.
- Defoy, D. (2013, August 24). *Psycholawlogy*. Retrieved from www.psycholawlogy.com: <http://www.psycholawlogy.com/2013/08/24/an-initial-guide-to-success-strategies-for-the-managing-the-legal-glass-ceiling-building-on-the-success-of-others/>
- Ferrari, M. (2011). Féminisation des grandes entreprises françaises: dualisme discriminatoire ou bipolarisation sexuelle? Marrachech.
- Gavray, C. (2004). Trajectoires professionnelles féminines: Flexibilités et enjeux de genre. *Université de Liege*.
- Hafen, S. (2009). Organizational Gossip: A revolving door of regulation and Resistance. *Southern Communication Journal*, 223-240.
- Hewlett, S. A., Peraino, K., Sherbin, L., & Sumberg, K. (2010). The Sponsor Effect: Breaking Through the Last Glass Ceiling. *Harvard Business Review Research Report*.
- Lemiere, S., & Silvera, R. (2008). Les Différentes facettes Des inégalités salariales hommes-femmes. A. Cornet, J. Lauffer & S. Belghiti (Eds) *Le Genre Et La GRH: Les Défis De l'égalité hommes-femmes*.
- Litwin, A. H., & Hallstein, L. O. (2007). Shadows and silences: How women's positioning and unspoken friendship rules in organizational settings cultivate difficulties among some women at work. . *Women Studies in Communication*, 111-141.
- Lukas, C. (2011, April 12). *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052748704415104576250672504707048>
- Mainiero, A., & Sullivan, S. E. (2005). Kaleidoscope careers: An alternate explanation for the "Opt-out" revolution. *Academy of Management Executive*, 106-120.
- Meyer, M. (1999). In a league of Her Own.
- Morrison, Ann M., R. P. White, E. Van Velsor, and the Center for Creative Leadership. 1987. *Breaking the glass ceiling*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-Based Barriers to Senior Management Positions: Understanding the Scarcity of Female CEOs. *Journal of Business Ethics* 27 (4), 321-335.
- Pipes, S. C. (1996, April). Glass Ceiling? So What?
- Polachek, S. W. (1981). Occupational Self-Selection: A Human Capital Approach to Sex Differences in Occupational Structure. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 60-69.
- Rai, U. K., & Srivastava, M. (2008). Women Executives and the Glass Ceiling: Myths and Mysteries From Razia Sultana to Hillary Clinton. *BHU Management Review*, 79.
- Rana, B. (2007). A Study on Women, S Perception of Glass Ceiling in Private Organizations, Pokhara. *The Journal of Nepalese Business Studies*.
- Schneer, J. A. and Reitman, F. (2002) Managerial life without a wife: Family structure and managerial career success, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 37, 25-38
- S, D. L., Dolado, J. J., & Llorens, S. (2005). Ceiling and Floors: Gender Wage Gaps by Education in Spain. Spain.
- S., B.-M., Landrieux, K. S., & GRH et Genre. (2008). *Les Défis De l'égalité hommes-femmes*. Paris: Vuibert.
- Shandana Shoaib, R. (2010). The Glass Ceiling Effect: A Pakistani Perspective. *Business Review Federal Glass Ceiling Commission*. 1995b. Solid Investment: Making Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital. .
- Tischler, L. (2004). Where Are The Women? . *Fast Company*, 52-60.
- Zahid Ali Chanar. (2011). Gender Discrimination in Workforce and its impact on the Employees. *Commerce & Social Science*, 177-191.